

3. The 3427 Sea Ledge Lane appeal will be heard by the City Council on December 18, 2007. Commissioner Thompson will represent the Commission.
 4. The Rogers Court appeal has been rescheduled to February 26, 2008.
 5. The 517 Chapala Street mixed-use project was approved by the Planning Commission. The preliminary approval was denied by the Historic Landmarks Commission and will be appealed to the City Council. The hearing date is pending.
 6. The 518 State Street will be appealed to City Council, but there is not a date yet.
 7. The Veronica Meadows appeal decision was in Superior Court, overturning the project approval. The EIR was ruled to be adequate but decertified by the Court. It will return to City Council for further action.
- C. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.
- Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 2:05 p.m.

Paul Hernadi, Citizens Planning Association (CPA), addressed the Commission referring to CPA's emailed letter listing recommendations for the General Plan.

The Commission expressed its appreciation of the CPA for the serious thought and detail given in its recommendations.

Chair Jacobs announced that the General Plan Update discussion originally scheduled for today, will be held as a Special Meeting on January 3, 2007.

Chair Jacobs closed the public hearing at 2:11 p.m.

II. **NEW ITEM:**

ACTUAL TIME: 2:11 P.M.

APPLICATION OF JESSICA GRANT & NILS HAMMERBECK, AGENTS FOR ANDREAS VON BLOTNITZ, 565 YANKEE FARM ROAD, 047-030-005 A-1/SD-3, SINGLE FAMILY AND COASTAL OVERLAY, ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL (MST2005-00759)

The proposed project involves demolition of an existing single family residence, with attached carport, and constructing a new residence with an attached garage. The proposed two-story residence would be approximately 6,773 square feet with an attached 730 square foot garage and an attached 402 square foot workshop. Additionally, a swimming pool with a 450 square foot cabana would be constructed approximately twenty-five feet south of the residence. Approximately 2,945 cubic yards of cut and 2,600 cubic yards of fill would be required for the project. The excess 345 cubic yards would remain on site. Access to the site

would be provided by the existing driveway, which will be repaved and widened to sixteen feet, once utilities are installed. A fire hydrant would be installed at the end of a hammer head turnaround and is part of fire access and safety plan consistent with Fire Department requirements.

The discretionary applications required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit (SBMC § 28.44.060 Permit Required).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15303, New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures.

Case Planner: Peter Lawson, Associate Planner

Email: plawson@santabarbaraca.gov

Peter Lawson, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Nils Hammerbeck, Architect, gave the applicant presentation and introduced his team: Jessica Grant, Penfield & Smith; Lane Goodkind, Landscape Architect; Susan Basham, Legal Council, Price, Postal, & Parma; and Hady Zadpanau, Penfield & Smith.

Staff answered the Planning Commission's questions about sewer line opportunities on the parcel; sewer and septic options; condition for requirement of site to be placed on a sewer; clarification of the accessory building space; and clarification of the lot area square footage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) numbers.

Scott Vincent stated that the project would have to find a way to deal with its waste and perhaps look at initiating an assessment district. The City cannot make sewer line extension a requirement since this is not a request for a subdivision.

Mr. Hammerbeck answered Planning Commission questions about plate heights.

Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 3:05 P.M.

The following people spoke in opposition of the project or with concerns:

1. Mary Weisman, neighbor: exceeds Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance (NPO) height and square footage; neighborhood incompatibility.
2. Jana Young, neighbor: exceeds NPO height and square footage; neighborhood incompatibility; drainage, runoff, and grading.
3. Lori Rafferty, Braemar Ranch Homeowners Association: exceeds NPO height and square footage; neighborhood incompatibility; destabilization of the hillside; read Braemar Ranch Homeowners Association letter into the record.
4. Cathie McCammon: size and topography incompatible with neighborhood; defies NPO Guidelines.

5. Chair Jacobs read the letter of Jeff Young, neighbor, into the record: too high for neighborhood; increase in impervious surface will add more storm water to his home; landscaping and structure will alter natural flow of surface water.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:17 P.M.

Mr. Vincent clarified the discussion of the NPO language that was approved by the Ordinance Committee.

The Commission acknowledged the applicant's favorable design and appreciated the use of Green Building Design, but was not ready to support the project; recommended the applicant look to a continuance.

The Commission provided the applicant the following suggestions: 1) Suggested the project be reduced in scale to 100% FAR maximum; 2) No grading on 30% slope; 3) Inclusion of a detailed drainage plan; consider bioswale opportunities; 4) Condition the project to connect to the City sewer system; 5) Reconfirm the FAR calculations, including a diagram; 6) Provide a 3D model that shows the project as related to the site; and Support returning to Architectural Board of Review for further review.

Some Commissioners expressed a desire to have the project reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review over the Single Family Design Board. Mr. Vincent clarified the FAR guideline. If it is less than .85 FAR, it will stay with ABR. Otherwise, it will go to SFDB. The project would be returning to the Planning Commission for a Coastal Development Permit.

Susan Basham, Attorney, offered a two month extension beyond January 13, 2008 and asked for a continuance.

Mr. Hammerbeck voiced his concerns with the review process by recapping the numerous review boards that are making recommendations on this project.

Mr. Vincent recommended that the project return to the Single Family Design Review board for compliance and concurrence with consistency findings with the NPO. However, Ms. Hubbell stated that the design board review determination will be based on the project's redesign.

MOTION: Jostes/Larson

Continued indefinitely at the request of the applicant.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0